



EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**LEVEL 1 AND LEVEL 2 CERTIFICATES IN
LATIN LANGUAGE AND LATIN LANGUAGE &
ROMAN CIVILISATION**

SUMMER 2018

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?l=en>

Online Results Analysis

WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.

Annual Statistical Report

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

Unit	Page
Latin Language Level 1 – Unit 9511	1
Latin Language Level 2 – Unit 9521	4
Roman Civilisation Level 1 – Unit 9512	7
Roman Civilisation Level 2 – Unit 9522	10
Roman Civilisation Levels 1 & 2 – Units 9513 & 9523	12
Latin Language Level 1 – Unit 9514	14
Latin Language Level 2 – Unit 9524	17

LEVEL 1 LATIN LANGUAGE

Summer 2018

UNIT 9511

General Comments

The overall standard was good, with almost all candidates following the story line to the end. As is often the case, the translation questions provided the greatest challenge. Learners should also be encouraged to check noun endings carefully to determine whether the noun is singular or plural as this was also highlighted as an area of weakness for some. A final, but important, general tip is to look *only* to the lemma quoted in the question when giving an answer. This year, several candidates lost marks because they failed to look at the correct part of the Latin passage.

Q.1 All answered this correctly.

Q.2 (i) Most candidates knew '*uxor*' but those who said that Catullus wanted to live with his wife were not credited with a mark, as this assumes he already had one.

(ii) Generally well done, with most candidates knowing the Latin for 'mother' and 'father'. Some however, confused *habito* with *habeo*.

Q.3 Generally well done.

Q.4 (i) Generally well done; there did not seem to be a particular pattern to the incorrect answers.

(ii) This question provided the first challenge in correctly identifying a plural noun – *dei*. However, several candidates who saw this was plural did not see it was in the vocative case. The relative was often omitted but many were helped by the addition of *vos* to correctly identify the person of *potestis*. It was pleasing to see many candidates deal with the imperative successfully. Those who translated *facere* as 'to make' were credited.

Q.5 This was well done.

Q.6 Very few candidates scored 4/4 for this question. Most failed to see *dona* was plural (even if they had chosen the correct answer in Q3 which mentioned 'gifts'). Some also failed to see *precationem* was singular.

Q.7 This was generally well done. However, candidates must be advised not to 'hedge their bets' as a correct answer cannot be credited if it sits alongside an incorrect choice.

Q.8 As *miser* was glossed, candidates had to recognise the superlative to be credited. Over half did.

Q.9 Only the best candidates scored 4/4 on this question. Several took the phrase *in tablino laborabat* out of context and wrote that he was not able to work in the study. Again, recognising the plural ending of *epistulas* was a common challenge. Another

common mistake was to read beyond the lemma and say that he was unable to eat the dinner prepared by his mother.

- Q.10 (i) It was very good to see almost all candidates knew *cena*. Very few made the common mistake of confusing this word with *cibus*. Most translated the superlative correctly.
- (ii) A small number of candidates thought the mother could not eat the dinner and others missed out *poterat* but generally this was well done.
- (iii) This was generally well done. Those who did not score full marks tended to mistranslate *manere*.
- Q.11 This was well done.
- Q.12 A surprising number of candidates only gave either 'slaves' or 'women' as a response to this 2 mark question.
- Q.13 (i) This was quite well done, but common errors were the correct translation of the preposition *per* (some simply wrote 'in') and making sure that *vias* was made plural.
- (ii) Generally well done; candidates who wrote 'to the Circum Maximum' were credited. A small minority did not use the word list and thought that Circum Maximum was a person.
- Q.14 This translation was a good discriminator, but it was pleasing to see so many candidates deal with the present participle well. Omitting *subito* or *tamen* were common errors for those who did not score full marks. Equally, some candidates did not see that *puellam* was accusative and made the girl the subject of the sentence.
- Q.15 (i) Although this is a relatively familiar sentence structure from previous papers, this question proved to be quite challenging for many candidates. Several only scored one mark, simply saying that the girl was beautiful.
- (ii) This translation was done quite well; *statim* remains a difficult word with several candidates either mistaking it for *stare* or *subito* or else omitting it altogether. The pronouns were also good discriminators; those who failed to see that both were referring to the girl were only penalised once.
- Q.16 (i) Very well done.
- (ii) Candidates had a good general understanding here. Those who did not get 3/3 did not give all the details, omitting either *omnes* or *alias*.
- Q.17 This was a good discriminator, challenging most candidates. *facere* and *debebat* needed to be translated correctly within this context; here 'make' (*facere*) or 'owe' (*debebat*) did not work.
- Q.18 (i) Most scored at least one mark here. Those who did not get 2/2 tended to get the colour of the team Catullus was praising mixed up.
- (ii) This was quite well done, although some candidates chose *laudabat* and so could not get the correct English translation either.

- (iii) Some candidates were confused as to which team Catullus supported.
- Q.19 This was well done.
- Q.20 This was a rare occasion when both 'no / not at all' and 'very little / the least' were all acceptable. Most candidates gained a mark here, although a small number wrote 'a little bit' which was not accepted. The rest of the answer was also done well.
- Q.21 (i) *puella irata clamavit* was dealt with successfully by most candidates. The most common error was to translate *clamavit* as 'said', which was not credited. *quam* was a good discriminator and a small number of candidates struggled with *stultus*.
- (ii) Generally well done.
- Q.22 (i) Here was another example of candidates not reading within the lemma; several looked to the sentence before the lemma quoted in the question and said he had to flee from the arena. *vera* was glossed so candidates had to get the meaning of *dicere* to be credited with the mark.
- (ii) the majority of candidates got the gist of the answer, but they needed to include each detail of *qui bene vivunt* to get 3/3.
- (iii) Most candidates achieved at least 1/2 here but not all gave the superlative and the correct translation of *semper*.
- Q.23 Answers needed to include **both** a description of Catullus' character **and** some sort of justification for this description. Answers varied hugely, with some candidates expressing very strong opinions! It was very encouraging to see how many candidates had engaged with the story so as to support their descriptions of Catullus with details from the passage.

Conclusion

Almost all those who sat this paper attempted every question and thus all candidates were able to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding. Several questions served as good discriminators but on the whole answers showed a good knowledge of Latin vocabulary and the syntax required at this level.

LEVEL 2 LATIN LANGUAGE

Summer 2018

UNIT 9521

General Comments

With the first appearance of the new Eduqas GCSE, the entry for this continuing Level 2 paper was considerably smaller than in previous years, but still provided a full range of marks. The overall standard was high, with few scripts failing to achieve a grade. The momentum test was effective, with Question 3 proving more demanding than Question 2; whereas a good number of candidates achieved full marks on the translation, hardly any did so for the second comprehension.

Comments on individual questions

- Q.1 (a) nearly all answered correctly; only a few thought that 'Colchians' was the king's name.
- (b) all answered correctly.
- (c) (i) nearly all answered correctly.
- (ii) some gave 'went' rather than 'came' or 'arrived'.
- (d) the great majority answered correctly.
- (e) (i & ii) nearly all answered correctly.
- (f+g) again, most chose correctly.
- (h) very few omitted *eum*.
- (i) (i) this question provided the first real challenge for more able candidates: most noted the seizure of the fleece, but many failed to note the ship or its ownership by Jason.
- (ii) a good many interpreted *ab urbe* as 'to the city'; *sine mora* was often unknown or omitted.
- (j) this was by some margin the most challenging question in this section, with only the best candidates gaining all four marks. Very many, uncertain of the vocabulary or unable to identify the indirect question, omitted or confused *ubi cognovit quid fecissent*.

Q.2 *Iason et Medea trans mare ad Graeciam navigaverunt.*

Most translated this sentence correctly. Some did not know *trans*, and there was occasional confusion of tenses, with the verb here rendered as pluperfect, while *adiuvisset* in the next section was made simple past.

Iason, cum Medea eum adiuvisset, ei amorem suum promisit.

cum Medea was most often 'with Medea'; few knew *cum* as 'when', and even fewer as 'since'. *adiuvisset* was often confused with *audivisset*. Most guessed at the meaning of *ei amorem suum promisit*, giving 'promised to love her' or 'promised that he loved her', neither of which was given much credit.

Medea erat laeta, quod volebat uxor eius esse.

Most handled this sentence well.

ubi domum Iasonis advenerunt, a patre eius salutabantur;

Half the candidates wrote 'when Jason came home'. The phrase *a patre* was identified by a small minority of candidates. Equally few recognised the imperfect passive.

sed ille tam senex erat ut vix e sede surgere posset.

There was much confusion over *ille* and *tam*, with the latter rarely correctly identified. Few spotted the result clause. Some did not know the vocabulary of *surgere* or *posset*.

Medea herbas composuit, ut eum iterum iuvenem faceret.

Many guessed a sensible meaning for *composuit*. *ut faceret* generated many errors among those who did not recognise the purpose clause or the meaning of the verb.

pater Iasonis fratrem habebat, Peliam nomine. Pelias quoque senex erat.

Most handled this section successfully. Some did not know *quoque* and omitted it.

filiae eius Medeam oraverunt ut Peliam sicut patrem Iasonis sanaret.

Few candidates worked out *filiae* as 'daughters'; the singular was ten times more common than the plural (as it was in the later appearances), and 'son' was almost as common as 'daughter'. Many did not recognise the indirect command: 'and' and 'so that' were common errors. Some switched Pelias and Jason's father.

Medea tamen, cum Pelias crudelis esset, filias eius adiuuvare nolebat.

The causal use of *cum* was the only version accepted here; very few got this; 'with Pelias being cruel' was very common. Many did not know *adiuvare*.

herbae, a Medea datae, eum non sanaverunt sed necaverunt.

Very many took *herbae* as singular. Only the best knew what to do with the participle or the preposition.

ubi filiae hominis necati cognoverunt quid Medea fecisset, eam et Iasonem ex urbe egerunt.

Again the participle defeated most candidates; many treated it as an indirect statement ('knew that the man had been killed'); few linked the genitive to *filiae*. Many did not know *quid*. Nearly all made *eam et Iasonem* the subjects of the unknown verb *egerunt* ('left' was the commonest rendering).

- Q.3
- (a)
 - (i) many omitted *aliam*.
 - (ii) many omitted *libenter* or guessed its meaning wrongly ('freely' was not accepted).
 - (b) this was often the only wrong answer in this section; clearly candidates did not know all the time phrases.
 - (c)
 - (i) most noted that Jason had taken a liking to the king's daughter, but only a minority could work out the meaning of *Iasoni non iam placebat*.
 - (ii) nearly all gave a sensible answer here, usually the fact that they had two sons.
 - (d) 'at the wedding' was a very frequent, and incorrect, response; few knew *de* or *nuntium*.
 - (e)
 - (i) many omitted the superlative.
 - (ii) most omitted *diro*.
 - (f)
 - (i) most correctly gave a derivation rather than a translation. There was a far wider spread of choices than has ever appeared before, most of which were acceptable; however, the frequent 'miss' and 'miserable' were not accepted.
 - (ii) many did not know *misit* and wrote 'gave'.
 - (iii) all answered correctly.
 - (g) the great majority made the right choices.
 - (h)
 - (i) nearly all answered correctly, with the singular 'shout' the only frequent error.
 - (ii) weaker candidates gave only one of the two actions of the king.
 - (iii & iv) all answered correctly.
 - (i) there was much confusion here about what Medea ordered her sons to do and about who killed whom.

Conclusion

The paper differentiated very effectively, generating a wide spread of marks.

LEVEL 1 ROMAN CIVILISATION

Summer 2018

UNIT 9512

General Comments

The standard of performance was again high: there were very few poor scripts and only a handful of rubric errors. Topic 3: The Roman Army proved to be much less popular than Topic 4: Entertainment and Leisure, following the pattern in previous years when these topics have been offered.

Although many candidates had studied the source material, on which the questions in Section A are based, the examiners would urge them also to study the extra information given in bullet points which accompany each source.

In Section B in both topics, there were some excellent answers where candidates addressed the question being asked. Some, however, still took the opportunity to write down every fact they knew about the subject, often ignoring the evaluative element to the question. The format of the questions often led to very good pieces of imaginative writing but some did not score highly because they lacked detail and evaluation.

Topic 3: *The Roman Army*

Section A

- Q.1 This question was done well.
- Q.2 This was generally well done although the numbers of men in a century in (c) ranged from 30 to 25,000.
- Q.3 The references to Roman numerals were usually well answered. It was pleasing to see that many candidates had used the source material during their preparation for this paper and therefore knew what the duties of a *beneficiarius* were.
- Q.4 Most candidates answered well although many ignored the word 'comfortable' in (c) and referred to the size of the *praetorium*, or that it was well protected.
- Q.5 Almost everyone recognised the facilities pictured here – one or two thought it was a *thermopolium* – and predictably, (b) was also done well. In (c), however, a surprisingly high number of candidates put the answers the wrong way around.

Section B

Overall, the essays were reasonably well done. Many candidates knew lots of facts – although some got them confused – but evaluation was not quite so sound.

- Q.6 Most knew that centurions were paid more than the other soldiers (amounts varied a lot) and that they could beat the men with a vine stick. Unfortunately for some, this was all they knew and they wrote at length about life in the army generally.

- Q.7 The cavalry was a popular feature and many also mentioned the special skills of such auxiliaries as archers and slingers. In the past, questions about auxiliaries have not always been done well but there were some good answers this year.
- Q.8 This was probably the most popular essay as it gave candidates the opportunity to write everything they knew about weapons and training; however, they knew less about the organisation and discipline of the legion and the 'other soldiers' tended to be ignored.
- Q.9 Surprisingly, several candidates seemed not to understand 'peace time' or just ignored the question. Some who had also answered question 8 seized the opportunity to write again about training and weapons but most of those who chose this title were at least able to get the soldiers out into the local settlement to meet the girls!

Topic 4: *Entertainment and Leisure*

Section A

- Q.1 (a) was not always recognised, with answers such as 'swimming' cropping up quite often. Most candidates knew that condensation was involved in (b) but the explanations were sometimes convoluted and didn't always get the point. There were some very good answers to (c) with one or two candidates drawing detailed diagrams.
- Q.2 For (a) most candidates could identify the *spina* correctly although the *carceres* proved more of a challenge. Virtually everyone scored full marks on (b) and both parts of (c) were well done, except for those who misread the question and explained why going to the races was enjoyable.
- Q.3 Both parts were well done although some thought the character shown was the old master.
- Q.4 In (a), so many candidates wrote that a *murmillo* had a fish on his head that it was a relief when someone referred to the crest on his helmet! (b) was not particularly well done. Weaker candidates were not sure about (c) with 'He'd lost' being a common error (possibly thinking about a wooden spoon?).
- Q.5 all parts were generally well answered although some thought in answer to (c) that a beast-fighter with no armour either made the fight more interesting for the audience or made it fairer as the animal had no armour! The list of animals in answer to (d) included deer, rabbits and ostriches, none of which seemed to fit the bill as 'dangerous'.

Section B

Candidates seemed to enjoy the selection of topics, questions 6 and 9 being the most popular. However, as with Topic 3, most saw these questions as an excuse to write down pages of facts which were not always relevant anyway. Consequently, many did not actually address the question and so evaluation was frequently missing.

- Q.6 This was the most popular of all but the description of a visit to the baths in stage 9 of the *Cambridge Latin Course* was often quoted verbatim. Many began their essay in the first person but changed part way through to a factual third person account. Most managed at least some evaluation by referring to the noise (Seneca was often

mentioned) and to the presence of thieves. Quite a number cited the embarrassment of bathing naked as a reason for not going to the baths, surely a more modern attitude.

- Q.7 Many of the responses were disappointing with many being content to describe every kind of gladiator who might fight in the arena. The design and atmosphere of the Colosseum prompt was pretty much ignored.
- Q.8 Although some candidates confused comedy and pantomime, there were some very pleasing answers here. For some, however, there was little explanation of how the various elements of the plays made them enjoyable.
- Q.9 This was quite well done although some ignored the more tedious aspects of chariot racing.

Conclusion

Most candidates seemed to have enjoyed studying these aspects of the Roman world. However, in order to score highly in the Section B questions, candidates do need to include relevant facts **and** evaluation and this should be made very clear to them when preparing for this examination.

LEVEL 2 ROMAN CIVILISATION

Summer 2018

UNIT 9522

General Comments

Although entries were down from previous years with the advent of the new GCSE qualification, there were nevertheless some very good scripts this summer. Candidates seemed to have enjoyed studying the topics and generally knew the subject matter well.

Topic 3: The Roman Army proved to be much less popular than Topic 4: Entertainment and Leisure, following the pattern in previous years when these topics have been offered. In fact, only a handful of candidates attempted the Roman Army questions (although a few answered both sections) and the standard of responses was variable.

Although work was generally well presented, in some cases virtually illegible scripts still caused problems for the examiners. Candidates should be reminded that they will lose marks if their writing cannot be deciphered. Latin terms were on the whole spelled correctly which is commendable.

In both topics, the longer questions which required evaluation were the discriminators between the weaker and best candidates. Some candidates seemed to home in on a key phrase in the question, then write everything they knew about the subject, whether relevant or not. Others did not read the question carefully enough and answered a question which was not being asked (for example, why anyone would benefit from joining the army rather than, specifically, an auxiliary, which is what the question required).

Topic 3: *The Roman Army*

- Q.1 Part (a) was generally answered well although some thought the soldier was an *aquilifer*. One thought he was 15 when he died and had served in the army for 12 years! There were some good answers to (b) from those who had read the question carefully: others wrote more generally about life in the Roman Army.
- Q.2 (a) was done well. In (b), there were often long, long descriptions of weapons lifted word for word from stage 25 of the *Cambridge Latin Course*. These answers invariably lacked evaluation as the 'confident in battle' element was completely ignored.
- Q.3 Parts (a) and (b) were done well. In (c), there was a tendency simply to list what a soldier might do in peace time without much evaluation as to why the activities were demanding or relaxing.
- Q.4 If candidates recognised the building, the whole of the question tended to be done well. Some thought the granary was a bath, others a latrine.
- Q.5 This proved a difficult question for many: they had no idea what the camp prefect did, although the information is in the Resource Booklet. Parts (a) and (b) were therefore not done well. (c) was much better although the amount a soldier was paid, and what he might earn if he were to be promoted, fluctuated alarmingly.

Topic 4: *Entertainment and Leisure*

- Q.1 Parts (a) and (b) were generally well answered. Even those candidates who were unable to identify the turning point still answered (a)(ii) correctly. (c) was done well; candidates had prepared thoroughly for this type of question.
- Q.2 As with question 5 in the Roman Army section, this question caused real problems which was somewhat unexpected. Many candidates failed to identify Licentiosus as a *retiarius* in spite of the neck guard shown in the picture and this led to consequential errors in (b) which examiners endeavoured to accommodate. Responses in (c) were often disappointing as candidates did not refer to 'variety' in the gladiatorial shows. Some candidates described every sort of fighter and their equipment but little else. The better candidates mentioned the unpredictability of the outcome, use of animals, executions and re-enactments of sea battles.
- Q.3 Parts (a) and (b) were almost always correct. (c) produced some very good responses although there was, as ever, some confusion between pantomime and comedy. Weaker candidates relied on a description of the various features of pantomime with little evaluation.
- Q.4 This was very well done with many candidates gaining full marks.
- Q.5 Although this question was well answered, a significant number of candidates thought that **A** was a swimming pool. The essays for (b) were usually very detailed with specialist terms spelled correctly (or nearly so). There was a tendency for some to quote verbatim the information from stage 9 of the *Cambridge Latin Course*, much of which was not relevant to this particular question. However, as candidates then usually addressed the unpleasant aspects of a visit to the baths (mostly noise, thieves and prostitutes!) they still achieved high marks. The impression was that the Baths had been one of the topics concentrated on in class.

Conclusion

The resource booklet which is available on the website contains many useful pictures and texts relating to these topics. At Level 2, these are not the only resources which may appear on the examination paper but they do contain lots of information for candidates and the examiners would encourage teachers to use them.

The examiners noticed a tendency to ignore the space at the end of the paper for continuation of answers but to insert an extra booklet instead. In some centres, every candidate had included a supplementary booklet but not all had been used. If candidates do continue answers elsewhere, it is important that it is clear which question is being answered, especially in topic 4 where some of the descriptions of the atmosphere at the circus or at the amphitheatre could be very similar!

LEVEL 1 & LEVEL 2 ROMAN CIVILISATION

Summer 2018

UNITS 9513 & 9523

General Comments

Although entries were down on previous years, largely due to the new GCSE qualification, there was some very good work submitted for both Level 1 and Level 2. The titles attempted varied from those suggested on the WJEC website to some very imaginative topics in which candidates had a particular interest. Comparisons between the lives of Roman and modern women proved to be a popular title as did the similarities between aspects of Roman and modern entertainment.

However, as in previous years, some centres had not submitted their proposed titles in advance to WJEC for approval. This should have been done by 31st October 2017. A number of candidates were therefore disadvantaged by tackling topics which were not suitable, either because they were not sufficiently focused or because they lacked scope for proper evaluation. This was particularly the case where candidates had attempted a more historical title (for example, an account of the tactics used in the 2nd Punic War) or a vague comparison of life in Roman and modern times.

It was disappointing to see that some centres had ignored suggestions by the moderator to change their proposed titles and had used them anyway.

Some candidates seemed to have taken a topic from another area of the curriculum and made an attempt to find a Roman equivalent. Although these candidates are to be commended for trying something new, they were often unsuccessful in finding enough relevant evidence from the Roman world to support their arguments. Candidates should remember to give roughly equal weight to both parts of the comparison in order to gain good marks for use of primary evidence and evaluation.

Quite a number of candidates had chosen a specific topic but seemed to stray into writing about something quite different. Examples include an assessment about the lives of women in Roman times in which the candidate wrote at great length about gladiator fights, introduced by the sentence 'Women were sometimes allowed to visit the amphitheatre...': another spent almost half of an assignment on entertainment then and now describing how people are manipulated into being ridiculed on an American chat show.

In a number of centres, several candidates chose identical titles for their assessments, some using exactly the same resources and source material. WJEC recommends that not more than two or three candidates should attempt the same title so centres should vary future titles as much as possible to avoid this overlap.

The quality of some of the A4 source sheets gave cause for concern. Although some candidates included a very good range of primary sources, both literary and visual, and referred to these throughout their assessments, many did not. In a significant number of cases, candidates did not appear to understand what constitutes a primary source, listing websites and modern books as primary evidence. Others referred to (for example) a picture of a mosaic without including the picture or any further explanation on their A4 sheet. Many literary sources were not attributed to the author.

A handful of candidates did not include a sources sheet at all, even though some had been awarded high marks for use of primary sources. In this circumstance the original mark was reduced by the moderator.

Centres should also be reminded that the A4 sheet is the only resource candidates should have with them when they are writing their assignment. They should not have access to the internet or any storage facility: some assignments made reference to sources which did not appear on their A4 sheet.

Most scripts were word-processed and well presented: one or two handwritten assessments were untidy and difficult to read. It always helps the moderation process if scripts are clearly presented. It is also appreciated when candidates observe and record the recommended word count for each level. Very few candidates did this.

Conclusion

The vast majority of teachers wrote helpful supporting comments on their candidates' work, based on the assessment criteria, and they generally placed candidates in the correct rank order. Marks were mostly allocated from the correct band. However, some teachers were too generous particularly when awarding marks for the selection and use of primary sources (AC3). In some cases, candidates had included only secondary sources but were still awarded high marks.

To gain marks in the top band for AC3 a candidate should include a good selection of appropriate primary sources on the A4 sheet and make reference to all of these in the essay. Ideally these sheets should contain both pictures and quotations.

Annotation on the scripts was generally excellent and this made the moderation process very straightforward and was much appreciated.

Controlled assessment remains a valuable opportunity for students to develop their research skills into topics which particularly interest them.

LEVEL 1 LATIN LANGUAGE

Summer 2018

UNIT 9514

General Comments

The standard of papers this year was once again high. Although some individual words or phrases proved challenging to some, most candidates were able to follow the storyline through to the end. Many candidates translated into natural English prose rather than stick to the Latin word order, which was very good to see. As is often the case, sentences without a nominative noun were good discriminators.

Comments on individual sections

Cato filium, Marcum nomine, habebat. Marcus septem annos natus erat.

Most candidates started well. A small number of candidates translated this sentence in the present tense before changing into the past for the remainder of the passage. Only a few candidates did not give the nominative form of Marcus in the first sentence.

itaque Cato puero litteratorem quaerebat.

Some candidates omitted *itaque* and others did not know *quaerebat* but the syntax did not cause too many problems.

tandem Marcum ad litteratorem, qui in media urbe prope forum laborabat, misit.

This was an early example of a sentence without a nominative, which provide challenging to most candidates. Several translations made *Marcum* nominative and added a second verb before later translating *misit*. The subordinate clause however, was done quite well, although not all candidates correctly identified the antecedent of *qui*. The prepositions were the biggest discriminators here.

ubi Marcus litteratorem conspexit, 'eheu!' inquit.

It was pleasing to see most candidates chose the correct translation for *ubi* in this sentence. No mark was attached to *eheu* although many candidates did in fact know what it meant.

hunc hominem agnosco. ferocior est quam omnes alii litteratores.

Here candidates were better at recognising the case of *hominem* in this sentence without a nominative. *hunc* was a good discriminator (some confused it with *illum*). Not all candidates recognised the comparative form of *ferocior* and several translations omitted *omnes* or *alii*. Those that changed the sentence structure to 'he is the fiercest of all other teachers' were given full credit.

amici, quos docet, eum maxime timent.

This sentence proved challenging for all but the most able candidates. Common errors included making *amici* singular, not correctly identifying the number and/or case of *quos*, mistranslating *timent*.

quamquam multa legebat multaque scribebat, Marcus litteratori placere non potuit.

quamquam was not always correctly translated, but it was encouraging to see so many candidates translating *–que* in the correct place. Some translations failed to achieve full marks because the second *multa* was omitted. The second half of the sentence was more difficult for some candidates; the most common error was to omit *potuit* and fail to recognise the infinitive in *placere* (e.g. Marcus did not please the teacher – or sometimes, ignoring the gloss given in the wordlist, Marcus was not pleased with the teacher).

ille eum saepe vituperabat.

This section was done well. A pleasing number translated *saepe* as ‘often’ (rather than ‘always’).

cur pater tuus mihi plus pecuniae non dat? tu semper lente, numquam celeriter laboras.

Those who did not get full marks in this section tended to try to make *pater* vocative and changed the verb into a second person verb. Not all candidates knew what *cur* meant and some thought that Marcus was talking to the teacher and confused *tuus/mihi* (e.g. Why does my father not give more money to you?).

num stultus es?’ clamavit.

As is often the case, some candidates confused *num* with *nonne*, but a pleasing number chose the correct translation. A small number of translations did not identify *es* as a second person verb and translated it as ‘he is’.

multos post dies Marcus consilium cepit. servum misit qui patri omnia narravit.

The first half of this section was generally done well. The second half proved much more challenging and a good discriminator. Vocabulary did not cause too many problems, but again, the lack of the nominative was the main factor. Some ignored *misit* and made the slave the subject of the whole sentence. On the other hand, it was very encouraging to see several translations render *omnia* in a very natural way, such as ‘everything’ or ‘the whole story’ rather than a more literal ‘all things’.

simulac Cato servum audivit, intellexit id quod facere debebat.

Some did not know *simulac* but otherwise the subordinate clause was generally done well. The main clause was more challenging, partly because both *facere* and *debebat* both have more than one meaning, so candidates had to choose which worked the best in this context. *id quod* was also problematic for many to untangle, but a good number were able to achieve almost full marks in this difficult sentence.

ad forum festinavit et litteratorem filium vituperantem vidit.

A pleasing number of candidates were able to see that Cato was the subject of this sentence. The discriminating factor lay in recognising that the participle agrees with

litteratorem. Those who did not see this often translated the participle as a verb with Cato as its subject.

iratissimus erat. hominem crudeliorem numquam viderat.

The superlative was recognised by most candidates; the comparative was less well done and weaker candidates had *hominem* as the subject of the sentence. *numquam* was omitted by some.

noli filium meum vituperare! tibi antea credidi

The prohibition was recognised by a good number of candidates but several confused *noli* with *nolo*. *credidi* also proved more difficult to some candidates than expected.

sed, nolo te litteratorem filio meo esse.

Many candidates understood this sentence very well. A common answer was 'but I don't want you to teach my son' which was credited with full marks.

Marce, ego te docere debeo. ego, pater tuus, optimus litterator sum.

It was pleasing to see so many candidates recognise the vocative in *Marce*. However, several translations lost marks as they omitted *debeo* and failed to recognise the infinitive *docere*. The last sentence was generally well done with only a few translating *sum* as if it were a future tense verb.

Conclusion

It was very encouraging to see the majority of candidates follow the story right up to the very end of the passage. Candidates are to be congratulated on the standard of their work.

LEVEL 2 LATIN LANGUAGE

Summer 2018

UNIT 9524

General Comments

With the first appearance of the new Eduqas GCSE, entries for the Level 2 Certificate, and for this optional paper in particular, were as expected much reduced. However, there were amply sufficient entries to provide a full spread of marks and to show up the features that caused difficulties for a large proportion of the candidates.

This year the comprehension tended to yield lower marks (in proportion) than the translation; this is partially explicable by the fact that the raw mark total for the translation was quite high and so more generous to candidates; another explanation is that vocabulary weaknesses caused many to lose the thread of the storyline or to omit essential details.

Vocabulary was often a problem for candidates, particularly the words specific to this Additional paper. Also problematic were the various uses of *ut* and correct handling of ablatives absolute. Pronouns caused some difficulty, especially when appearing in indirect statements.

Comments on individual questions

- Q.1
- (a) some did not know *virī* or *nobilis*.
 - (b) a substantial minority took *maritum* as the subject; some guessed the meaning of *maritus* as 'marriage'.
 - (c) many did not recognise or construe *oderat*.
 - (d) *petebant* was the main cause of difficulty here, with many guesses and inappropriate meanings. Candidates should be reminded that possible meanings of a Latin word that do not suit the particular context are not given credit.
 - (e)
 - (i) there were many correct choices here, in which candidates showed their ability to handle gerundives of obligation; however, half the candidates chose wrongly.
 - (ii) only a minority gained all three marks; most showed unfamiliarity with one or more of the relevant words: *solī*, *placere* and *debeo*.
 - (f) only the strongest candidates scored all 4 marks; the main problems were a widespread inability to construe the sentence and neglect of the superlative.
 - (g) about half correctly chose A and C.
 - (h) only the strongest noted the comparative *plus*; many omitted *quam ipsae*. The common response 'she had freedom' gained no credit, as *licentia* was glossed and the marks were for handling the more difficult words.

Q.2 *marito mortuo, Clodia maiorem licentiam habebat.*

Most handled this well. The commonest errors were a failure to insert a conjunction after converting the ablative absolute into a main clause, and ignorance of the irregular comparative.

unus inter amantes erat Caelius, cui Clodia multum pecuniae dederat ut favorem populi emeret.

Most handled the main clause correctly. Half the candidates translated *cui Clodia dederat* as 'who gave Clodia'. The purpose clause was badly handled, with very many treating *favorem* as the verb; there was also a widespread ignorance of the meaning of *emeret*.

nonnullos annos laeti erant, dum Caelius Clodiam subito sprevit.

The first part of this caused huge difficulties: the meaning and agreement of *nonnullos* were often unrecognised; many did not identify the time clause; and there was much variation in selecting an appropriate noun or pronoun for *laeti* to agree with, with many choosing a singular entity despite the plural verb. The meaning of 'until' for *dum* was unknown to most.

quae tam irata erat ut consilium ad eum puniendum caperet:

Many handled the connecting relative correctly, but there was widespread ignorance of *tam* and its role in foreshadowing a result clause. The result clause itself proved to be one of the most challenging elements in the paper, as only the best knew the phrase *consilium capere*; most wrote something like 'she planned to capture and punish him'.

dixit eum conatum esse se veneno necare.

The pronouns defeated most candidates, as did the subject of *dixit*, the result being that most had the wrong characters doing the various actions. Also few recognised *conatum esse* as a perfect infinitive.

in iudicio Cicero pro Caelio locutus est; Clodiam fraudis accusavit.

Clearly few candidates were familiar with 'trial' in its legal sense, with most writing 'in trial' rather than 'in the trial'; however there was no penalty for this, as it was a weakness of English rather than of Latin. The main difficulty was *locutus est*, the meaning of which was known to only a few; most wrote 'was placed before Caelius'. Also many candidates retained the oblique ending in the name, and so lost credit.

'Clodia' inquit 'est femina pessimi ingenii.

Very few knew the meaning of *ingenii*, and most made *pessima* agree with *femina*.

maritum dum vivebat semper decipiebat, ut vos omnes, iudices, scitis.

Weaker candidates, seeing *maritum* appear first in the sentence, assumed he was the subject. Very few knew the meaning 'as' for *ut*. Only a minority knew *scitis*.

nunc vos quoque decipere conatur.

Most tried to make *vos* the subject; a minority confused *vos* with *nos*.

Caelius tamen est vir optimi ingenii,

As with the previous parallel sentence, most made *optimi* agree with *vir*.

quod, simulatque intellexit qualis femina illa esset, eam reliquit.

The first difficulty here was the meaning of *qualis*, unknown to most; many translated it as 'what', and so *esset* became 'did'.

nolite feminae tam malae credere.'

The use of *nolite* to form a prohibition was unknown to most. Again *tam* caused problems.

Caelio liberato, Clodia numquam iterum a civibus visa est.

Most turned the ablative absolute into a main clause, usually failing to connect it properly to the following main clause. The perfect passive was not recognised by most.

Conclusion

It was rewarding to see this paper attracting a good number of candidates, the majority of whom demonstrated a well-developed grasp of the appropriate level of Latin.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk